

REMARKS

Claims 2-13, 15-38, 40-49, 81-106, and 119-141 are currently pending. Claims 1, 14, 39, 50-80, and 107-118 were canceled in prior Amendments. Claims 2, 26, and 27 are currently amended. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Claims 89-94 are canceled in the interests of expediting prosecution.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 81-88 and for indicating that claims 98-100 and 104-106 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants note that they do wish to pursue the issuance of claims 98-100 and 104-106. At this time, Applicants are not yet amending the objected to claims that would otherwise be allowable (claims 98-100 and 104-106), as it is hoped that, with the additional minor amendments included above to claims 2, 26, and 27, the Examiner will indicate that all of the remaining claims are allowable over the cited references.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-13, 15-23, 25-38, 40-49, 95-97, 101-103, 119-139 and 141 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsourikov et al. ("Tsourikov"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010574A1 (of record). (Although the Examiner did not explicitly list claims 138 and 141, the explanations of the rejection include a discussion of these claims; thus, Applicants are presuming the Examiner so intended to include them as part of this rejection.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In particular, each of Applicants' independent claims recite aspects that are nowhere present in Tsourikov or any other cited reference. Although independent claims 2, 26, and 27 have been amended for clarity, Applicants believe that these claims prior to amendment included acts or elements not taught, suggested or motivated by Tsourikov. However, for the sake of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 2, 26, and 27 to clarify, as suggested by the Examiner, that the "additional grammatical role" is *additional* in that it is a role that "cannot be determined from the parse structure." (See Office Action, dated December 27, 2006, hereinafter "Current Office Action".)

For example, independent claim 2 as amended recites “determining an additional grammatical role ..., wherein *the additional grammatical role is not determined from the parse structure and* the additional grammatical role indicates that the at least one of the meaningful terms is a subject or an object in addition to the grammatical role determined from the parse structure.” (Emphasis added to show additional language.) This additional language clarifies that the additional grammatical role is “in addition to” *the* role determined from the parse structure and is not determined from the parse structure. Claim 26 as amended also recites “determining an additional grammatical role ..., wherein the additional grammatical role is not determined from the parse structure and the additional grammatical role indicates that the at least one of the meaningful terms is a subject or an object in addition to the grammatical role determined from the parse structure.” In addition, claim 27 as amended recites “determine an additional grammatical role ..., wherein the additional grammatical role is not determined from the parse structure and the additional grammatical role indicates that the at least one of the meaningful terms is a subject or an object in addition to the grammatical role determined from the parse structure.” Accordingly, Applicants believe that amended claims 2, 26, and 27, and claims 3-13, 15-25, 28-38, 40-49, 95-106, and 119-141, at least by virtue of their dependencies, recite that at least one term is associated with at least two grammatical roles, one of which is a role that is not determined from the parse structure and is a subject or an object.

As previously discussed in detail in the Remarks filed by Applicants on October 19, 2006, Tsourikov nowhere indicates -- even in its description of multiple sets of fields for extracting eSAO patterns in the case of a “bit sentence” or a “complex query” -- the use of a grammatical role that is not determined from the parse structure and is associated with at least one term. In summary, Tsourikov at most describes recognition of a subject or an object grammatical role in addition to another grammatical role during eSAO extraction for a bit sentence or a complex query and only when it is determined *during the parsing phase, and from the parse structure itself*. (See, Tsourikov, page 7, para. 192-200, page 8, para. 268-290, and page 4, para. 85-92.) For the sake of brevity, Applicants have not included the entire set of arguments presented previously regarding Tsourikov, however, Applicants hereby incorporate these arguments by reference in their entirety.

Note as well that Applicants have further amended claim 27 to add that the parser and postprocessor elements “reside in a memory medium,” in accordance with recent guidelines regarding subject matter patentability. Such modifications are in concert with the USPTO Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Subject Matter Eligibility, published November 22, 2005, and recite structure that was previously inherent in the claims.

Also, the Examiner continues to reject each of the dependent claims over Tsourikov for various reasons. In the interests of expediting prosecution, Applicants again wish to note for the record that they traverse all of these rejections and reserve the right to present more specific arguments at a later time. In addition, Applicants hereby incorporate by reference the previous arguments regarding several of these dependent claims in their entirety.

Thus, for these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2-13, 15-38, 40-49, 95-106, and 119-141 are not taught, motivated or suggested by Tsourikov and therefore are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Tsourikov. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants if he disagrees that these amendments overcome this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection – Claims 24 and 140

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 24 and 140 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious over Tsourikov in view of Applicants’ admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As a preliminary matter, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons discussed above with reference to their corresponding independent claims, claims 2 and 26, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 24 and 140.

For the sake of completeness and correctness of the prosecution record, Applicants wish to note that they respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s re-characterization of this rejection as “admitted prior art” in the current Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that his taking of Official Notice in the prior Office Action (dated April 19, 2006) with respect to claims 24 and 140 was not traversed. (Current Office Action, p. 3, para. 4.) Applicants believe, however, that this Official Notice was properly traversed on page 27 in the

prior Remarks of October 19, 2006 (hereinafter “prior Remarks”). Specifically, Applicants indicated that they “respectfully traverse these rejections” and that “[w]ith respect to claims 24 and 140, although the incorporation of synonyms in a search query may be known for some purposes, the specific use of entailed verbs or related verbs to ‘*add additional grammatical relationships*’ is not.” (Emphasis added.) And, as described generally on pages 27-28 of the prior Remarks, “just because something is known [for one purpose], does not make it suggested or obvious to combine with a reference” and is not the same thing as knowing to use it for different purposes. Thus, Applicants specifically traversed and pointed out the errors in logic as to why the use of entailed verbs or related verbs in the specific context of the claim language (*i.e.*, for adding grammatical relationships) would not be well known just because synonyms may be known in other contexts. Specific recitations in the claim language cannot be ignored.

Also, the M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, to which the Examiner cites, makes clear that Official Notice is to be used only when “the facts so noticed are of notorious character and serve only to ‘fill in the gaps’ which might exist in the evidentiary showing...” Further, this section states that it “would not be appropriate ... where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well known.” In the case of claims 24 and 140, the use of entailed or related verbs (even if one were to consider them synonyms) “used to add additional grammatical relationships” as recited in the claims is not “capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.” Thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw his characterization that this is now “admitted prior art.”

Even assuming for the sake of argument that entailed verbs or related verbs used in a query are well-known in some instances, Applicants further note that neither Tsourikov nor the mere concept of using synonyms in a query teach, suggest, or motivate the use of “entailed verbs or related verbs... used to add additional grammatical relationships.” The Examiner has still not indicated where *in the references or known art* (explicitly or implicitly) there exists a motivation for modifying Tsourikov to use synonyms in the manner Applicants are claiming. First, Tsourikov does not teach or suggest the additional grammatical relationships as recited (“not determined from the parse structure...”) and so cannot possibly suggest modifications of what it does not embrace. Second, synonyms by themselves do not suggest their use with

additional grammatical relationships. Thus, the Examiner's self assertion of a motive "to increase the amount of relevant documents returned" or "to expand the query and give more results" does not substitute as evidence for motivation to combine. (Current Office Action, p. 11, p. 4.)

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections – Claims 89-94

The Examiner has also rejected claims 89-94 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Tsourikov in view of Arnold et al. ("Arnold"), U.S. Patent No. 6,910,003 (of record). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis and applicability of Arnold, even without giving patentable weight to aspects of the preamble as the Examiner so indicates, Applicants have canceled claims 89-94 in the interests of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 89-94, and further reserve the right to prosecute these claims at a future time if desired.

Conclusion


Based upon the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are allowable. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the Examiner to enter these amendments. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited

In the event the Examiner disagrees with Applicants or finds minor informalities, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative to discuss any remaining issues preventing an expeditious resolution and allowance of the remaining claims. Accompanying this Amendment is a supplemental Applicant Initiated Interview Request form in the event the Examiner does not agree that the claims are now allowable over the cited references. Applicants' representative can be contacted at (206) 622-4900.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC


Ellen M. Bierman
Registration No. 38,079

EMB:asl

Enclosure:
Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

912888_1.DOC